Claim 2, line 17, after "covering" insert—outer—; line 18, after "attachment", insert a period —— and delete the remainder of the claim.

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following comments.

The rejection of Claim 1 as unpatentable over Tsuji et al is respectfully traversed, since the reference fails to disclose or suggest the subject matter of applicants' claims. Note specifically that Tsuji et al selectively plates gold on the <u>inner</u> tips of the leadframe, to improve <u>wire bonding</u>, and not for solderability of the <u>outer</u> tips as claimed by applicants. Since wire bonding does not involve any use of solder, Tsuji et al is not relevant. Therefore, the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 2-15 as unpatentable over Tsuji in view of Kom et al is respectfully traversed, since the references fail to disclose or suggest the claimed invention. The Examiner mistakenly refers to Kom et al layer 62 as "nickel". See col 3, lines 51-56, identifying 62 as "precious metal". The Examiner mistakenly refers to 63 as "nickel and palladium", but the reference clearly identifies 63 as copper. Thus, the Kom sequence of layers is not at all similar to applicants'

sequence. Moreover, the Kom outer layer 62' covers the <u>entire</u> leadframe, and not merely the outer tips, as in applicants' claims. As stated earlier, Tsuji et al uses selective plating of gold to wire bonding, <u>not</u> solderability. No proper combination of the references could lead one skilled in the art to discover applicants' invention, nor any equivalent thereof. The rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

Applicants now believe the application is in condition of allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Gary C. Honevcunt

Reg. No. 20,250

Godwin White & Gruber

801 E. Campbell Road

Suite 655

Richardson, Texas 75081

(972)238-7160